

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2009-2010 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2004.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

| | | |
|--|------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Number of schools in the district: (per district designation) | 156 | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
| | 32 | Middle/Junior high schools |
| | 38 | High schools |
| | 0 | K-12 schools |
| | 226 | TOTAL |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 9252

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- ☒ Urban or large central city
☐ Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
☐ Suburban
☐ Small city or town in a rural area
☐ Rural

4. 5 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|---------------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 12 | 17 | 29 | 6 | | | 0 |
| K | 10 | 17 | 27 | 7 | | | 0 |
| 1 | 21 | 17 | 38 | 8 | | | 0 |
| 2 | 20 | 16 | 36 | 9 | | | 0 |
| 3 | 23 | 14 | 37 | 10 | | | 0 |
| 4 | 17 | 8 | 25 | 11 | | | 0 |
| 5 | 19 | 15 | 34 | 12 | | | 0 |
| TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL | | | | | | | 226 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 0 % Asian
 52 % Black or African American
 48 % Hispanic or Latino
 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 0 % White
 0 % Two or more races
 100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 47 %

This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

| | | |
|-----|--|--------|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 30 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 87 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]. | 117 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1. | 247 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4). | 0.474 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100. | 47.368 |

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 31 %

Total number limited English proficient 69

Number of languages represented: 1

Specify languages:

Spanish.

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 99 %

Total number students who qualify: 224

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-price school meals program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 9 %

Total Number of Students Served: 21

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>0</u> Autism | <u>1</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>1</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>18</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>4</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>0</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

| | Number of Staff | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | <u>Full-Time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
| Administrator(s) | <u>1</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Classroom teachers | <u>20</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>0</u> | <u>1</u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>5</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Support staff | <u>10</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total number | <u>36</u> | <u>1</u> |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 11 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 97% | 97% | 97% | 97% | 97% |
| Daily teacher attendance | 96% | 96% | 96% | 98% | 96% |
| Teacher turnover rate | 20% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% |
| Student dropout rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Please provide all explanations below.

Two housing projects in our attendance zone closed between 2007-2009, resulting in a loss of students. This caused a loss of teachers in this building.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Graduating class size | 0 | |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | 0 | % |
| Enrolled in a community college | 0 | % |
| Enrolled in vocational training | 0 | % |
| Found employment | 0 | % |
| Military service | 0 | % |
| Other (travel, staying home, etc.) | 0 | % |
| Unknown | 0 | % |
| Total | | % |

PART III - SUMMARY

H. S. Thompson Elementary Learning Center is the heart and soul of its community, known as BonTon. Nestled between two now demolished housing projects and a railroad track, excellence is achieved where most have declared it cannot happen. From academically unacceptable in 2005-06 to Exemplary in 2008-09 (with 100% of students meeting the standards on state assessments), this is the story of a “Lighthouse for Learning.”

A safe haven for students and their families, H. S. Thompson is staffed by a faculty with an average of 18 years of teaching experience who form the core of the school’s academic success. A continuous improvement plan for professional development allows all teachers to study best practices from some of education’s premier researchers and practitioners. This alone, though, does not begin to tell of the rich love each faculty and staff member has for the students. It is well-known that some of our students lack basic resources that many of us take for granted. If a student is unable to bring supplies or needs uniforms, the teacher and/or school provides whatever is needed so that each child has that particular barrier removed, and learning can take place. There is not a day that goes by that some student needs clothing laundered, and in true Thompson form, we wash and dry clothes. Marian Wright Edelman states, “Service is the rent we pay for being. It is the very purpose of life and not something you do in your spare time.”

Our belief is that H. S. Thompson is the best place that any child can be all day, every day. How do we build a strong academic foundation? It is through effort-based teaching and learning of students and faculty and the belief that a growth mind set can make all students smarter. Three years ago, the Dallas Independent School District began a district wide school reform through the Institute for Learning from the University of Pittsburgh and its Principles of Learning. Through this reform, we began to study the work of Lauren Resnick and effort-based learning, Carol Dweck and growth mind set, and Rick DuFour’s professional learning communities.

As we began to develop our professional learning communities, collaboration and study shaped the rigor and relevance of our lesson planning and preparation. This deep learning, infused with our high expectations, no-excuses work ethic, and pedagogical prowess, produced students who have become self-managers of their own learning.

A positive school culture and sense of community have been a long tradition at H. S. Thompson. It is through this tradition that Thompson established our “Lighthouse for Learning” theme. Lighthouses symbolize safe passage through stormy seas. Thompson’s lighthouse symbolizes the safety and love that each parent and student feels when they enter our doors. Each morning, the students recite the “Heritage Pledge,” which reminds them of the greatness of their heritage and their responsibility to do more than those who have gone before them. It is a creed that embodies “no child left behind.” Our yearly “block party” celebration brings together families and community to celebrate the successes of the year. It also springs forward the hope of the future that lies ahead.

The strength of any organization lies within the people that make up the organization. It is the collective group of all stakeholders that allows this learning community to flourish and thrive. Students leave H. S. Thompson with the academic, social, and emotional well being that allows them to graduate high school and college and become productive citizens. It is this lighthouse that is the beacon of BonTon.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

Positive academic growth began at H.S. Thompson Learning Center with a change in administration in the 2005-06 school year and the arrival of Principal Kamalia L. Cotton. Principal Cotton implemented a new and more student-centered culture at the school. Furthermore, she instilled in students the idea that they are personally responsible for their own learning. She has created a team approach to teaching and learning where teachers possess academic freedom and students experience success.

Over the last five years, Thompson students in Grades 3, 4, and 5 have made significant gains on state-mandated assessments with 100% meeting the standard in reading, writing, and mathematics and 96% meeting the standard in science in the 2008-09 school year. Depending on the content area, performance levels on state-mandated assessments vary. For example, in 2008-09, third grade students who met the passing standard achieved 68% in math, 64% in reading, fourth grade students 67% in math, and 70% in reading, and fifth grade students 68% in math and 67% in reading. While Thompson's march to mastery did not follow an easy, straight path (there were some setbacks along the way as our data reveal), staff and students were determined to make it to the top – a goal that was achieved in the 2008-2009 school year. The following statistics detail our journey.

Over the last five years, Thompson mathematics students in Grades 3, 4, and 5 gained an average 41% on state-mandated assessments. Third grade scores went from 50% of all students meeting standards in 2005-06 to 89% meeting standards in 2006-07. The following year, math scores decreased from 89% to 77% of Grade 3 students meeting standards. The next year, third grade math scores rose 16%, increasing students meeting standards to 93%. Another increase of 7% in the year 2008-09 brought third grade math students to 100% meeting standards. Fourth grade students scored an average 61% meeting standards in 2005-06 with an increase to 87% in 2006-07. Disappointed with a drop to 72% in 2007-08, fourth grade teachers began an initiative that engaged small groups of students in intensive, accelerated instruction, culminating in students reaching 100% in 2008-09. Fifth grade scores rose from 78% meeting standards in 2005-06 to 97% in 2006-07. While fifth grade experienced a decrease in scores to 89% in 2007-08, scores rose again in 2008-09 with 100% of students meeting standards.

Thompson students in Grades 3, 4, and 5 showed an average 37% increase in students meeting standards in reading on state-mandated assessments over the last five years. Third grade reading scores steadily increased from 68% in 2005-06 to 80% in 2006-07 to 86% in 2007-08 to 100% in 2008-09. Fourth graders meeting standards started at 53% in 2005-06, rose to 85% in 2006-07, dropped significantly to 63% in 2007-08, and increased to 100% in 2008-09. As with math, fourth grade teachers again implemented an intensive, accelerated instructional program to achieve the increase that their Thompson students made between the 2007-08 and 2008-09 school years. Fifth grade reading scores rose dramatically from 64% in 2005-06 to 88% in 2006-07, to 96% in 2007-08, and to 100% in 2008-09.

Fourth grade students have experienced increasing success on the state-mandated writing assessment. Test results show 73% meeting standards in 2005-06, 92% in 2006-07, 90% in 2007-08, and 100% in 2008-09.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

At H. S. Thompson, our assessment system includes the collection of both formative and summative and informal and formal assessment data. These data are used to determine strengths and improvement opportunities in student performance and teacher instruction. Because curriculum, instruction, and assessment form an inseparable triad, the materials we use, the teaching we provide, and the assessments we administer

are in alignment. We truly believe that our effective use of assessment data is a key factor in our becoming an exemplary school in the Dallas Independent School District.

At the beginning of the school year, teachers give a formative Pre-Inventory Assessment to determine where students are and what they have retained from the previous grade level. From the data, teachers create an individual profile for each student. Individual profile data are used to develop a class profile by subject area that shows mastery trends on state objectives. From the class profiles, a building-wide spreadsheet is developed that shows school-wide trends in student data. Data gathered from the spreadsheet are used to create Tier Groups based on students' individual needs and to develop differentiated instruction.

Throughout the school year, teachers work collaboratively to design and administer common formative and summative assessments each six weeks. These data determine content and skills that need to be re-taught and to identify students who will participate in the Extended Day Program, where they receive intensive, accelerated intervention.

Each six weeks, teachers meet in vertical teams by subject area to analyze student data. Data are used to collaboratively agree on school wide instructional strategies. In these day-long meetings, teachers also engage in cross-grade level dialogue; share best practices that are successful in their classrooms; develop informal, formal, and performance assessments; make individual intervention plans, and interpret state objectives.

At the end of the first semester, a formative assessment covering all objectives that will be tested on the state assessment is administered. These assessment data are used to drive instruction for the following semester, leading up to the state exams.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

At H. S. Thompson, information on student performance is communicated in a variety of ways. These include:

- **Principal-Student Goal Conferences:** The principal meets with each student one-to-one to discuss goals, previous test results, and what he/she would like to achieve in the future.
- **Newsletters:** Newsletters are sent home at the end of every six-week grading period. The newsletter includes academic information for the upcoming six weeks and a summary of teaching and learning from the previous six weeks.
- **Progress Reports:** A three-week report is issued midway through the six weeks to keep parents informed of their child's progress in academics and social skills growth.
- **Teacher-to-Parent Phone Calls and Conferences:** Both phone calls and parent conferences occur on an as-needed basis to communicate various student achievements, accomplishments, and challenges.
- **Parent Information Bulletin Boards:** These bulletin boards, assembled and updated throughout the school, are accessible to all school and community stakeholders.
- **Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) and Texas Assessment of Knowledge & Skills (TAKS) Night:** Held annually, this event involves the community, parents, students, and teachers. It gives an overview of previous student academic performance results and expectations for future student performance.

- Family Fun Nights: Throughout the year, Family Fun Nights outline each major content area and allow parents and students to focus on the importance of each area. On this night, we host community members, parents, and students. There are interactive games and activities, and food is served.
- Block Party: This is a community celebration of Thompson's success of the year. All stakeholders are invited to the end-of-year event.

The principal and teachers are always available to discuss assessment results and the meaning and use of data with all school stakeholders.

4. Sharing Success:

At H. S. Thompson, we are always open to sharing our successes and best practices with each other and with our colleagues in other schools and districts because we know information is power.

Our principal, Kamalia L. Cotton, leads by example in sending a monthly newsletter entitled, "The Principal's Pen." In her newsletter, our parents, community, and the district are informed of the educational opportunities offered at Thompson, the exciting learning that occurs in the classrooms, recommended ways to become involved in student learning at home, and upcoming events.

Faculty members follow the principal's lead and gladly share with other educators the factors that drive the success of our H. S. Thompson students. Learning walks and observations periodically occur in our building and are performed by principals, teachers, or associate principals from other schools and districts. Our visiting colleagues sit in the classrooms and walk through the building to see what they can learn about or affirm what they know about best practices and teaching. They are eager to take back new strategies to their campuses for implementation.

Our faculty shares through presenting and attending collaborative staff development sessions. It is through these sessions that two or more schools meet and present new, unusual ways of delivering information to students by way of the Internet, iInstruction Classroom Performance System with clickers, foldables, accountable talk opportunities, and metacognitive reading strategies.

We also share our success through Website lesson plans, email, and one-to-one telephone conversations. Faculty members serve as presenters and facilitators at district-wide staff development sessions, where we share strategies that have proven successful with our students. If a teacher or staff member feels that we are doing something that is district wide note worthy, the event or presentation is sent to the Dallas ISD newsletter, "The Communicator."

We have found that sharing is an avenue to develop relationships across the district, the state, and the country. We feel that sharing our success is not an option but a must if best practices are to be implemented by all teachers. To reach other students who are similar in background to the students we serve is a necessity if we are to educate the masses and truly leave no child behind.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

H. S. Thompson's curriculum reflects our mission to offer all students opportunities to achieve their best. We believe that every student is destined to become a productive citizen of great stature. We consider high expectations and student support our greatest virtues as we teach students and instill in them a positive work ethic.

Our curriculum is research based and aligned with district, state, and national educational standards. Designed by subject area and grade, curricular content is presented in an engaging, interactive, and high-impact learning environment where students work with real-world, relevant examples. Objectives addressed in the curriculum are provided to parents and other community stakeholders, so they can help students achieve the desired outcomes.

Curricula encompass reading, writing, math, science, social studies, fine arts and physical education with supplementary activities and intervention lessons for students who require differentiation. Specialized curricula address the unique needs of students in special education, ESL, bilingual, and talented and gifted programs. Instruction in all subject areas is guided by the Principles of Learning, which require that students engage in accountable talk and tasks that demand academic rigor.

Our reading curriculum focuses on the research-based strategies of phonemic awareness, phonics, high frequency words, vocabulary development, and comprehension. Textbooks and supplemental reading materials are used to enhance and reinforce skills required to become effective readers of both fiction and nonfiction selections. Each skill is taught by using various research-based strategies, activities, and intervention lessons that meet the individual needs of students. Students are given multiple opportunities to apply and practice all skills taught.

Consistent, effective math curriculum and instructional strategies are utilized across grade levels to ensure continuity of student learning. Using an interdisciplinary approach, teachers engage students in computation, real-world problem solving, vocabulary development, literature, hands-on activities, and writing. Staff development, vertical teaming, and grade-level planning enhance teachers' effectiveness as they analyze student strengths and opportunities for growth.

The science curriculum engages students from the time they enter the classroom. Students' first assignment is a Bell Ringer or Golden Nugget, a motivational question or statement that enhances student interest. Students respond to these focus questions or statements in their science journals. They then work collaboratively in small groups, and some are stationed at the computer, where they complete enrichment activities as lesson extensions. While students work in their groups, the teacher rotates among them to provide individualized instruction. The major focus is hands-on discovery and laboratory activities. Students are assessed through formal and informal measures, including performance-based assessment, interactive games, benchmark testing, and teacher-written items in the state assessment format.

The social studies curriculum combines a variety of instructional resources to actively engage students in mastering objectives. These include videos, high-interest books, and visual aids. In a variety of groupings, students use graphic organizers, such as Venn diagrams and sequencing charts to organize data. As students read, they take notes using graphic organizers or foldables. Student share what they have learned by creating PowerPoint presentations, dioramas, songs, and stories. Assessments are formal, including benchmarks, and informal, such as gallery walks in which students post their projects and other students critique their work.

The fine arts curriculum encompasses multiple components, including hand bells, vocal music, and visual arts. Students have numerous opportunities to perform publicly, compete, and experience professional arts performances.

Research has documented that students who are physically fit perform better academically than students who do not exercise. It is the goal of Thompson's physical education department that every student is physically fit and understands the importance of maintaining fitness.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

(This question is for elementary schools only)

H. S. Thompson's reading curriculum is designed to ensure that all students have a solid foundation for building instruction in decoding, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension skills. Students engage in a variety of research-based learning experiences that provide for differing proficiencies, abilities, and interests.

Early childhood classrooms provide activities and instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, listening, and oral language development to improve reading comprehension. In all grade levels, explicit phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension skills instruction are balanced with extensive reading of both decodable texts and quality literature. All literal/inferential comprehension skills are integrated throughout the teaching of the reading concepts in language arts classes and the content areas. Students receive large group, small group, and one-to-one instruction as needed.

The Principles of Learning are implemented to facilitate student-centered discussions that focus on the relevancy of concepts and provide opportunities for students to clarify, justify, and generalize their understanding. Teachers establish clear expectations through the use of criterion charts/rubrics for group performance, individual performance, learning, task participation and completion, and discussion within various settings.

Student progress is monitored weekly using a variety of assessments and profiling results. The district's Reading Benchmarks and the state-mandated Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI) are also used to monitor students' progress. Activities, such as Bell Ringers, Morning Message, after-school tutoring and literary element charts, are utilized based on individual classroom needs. Learning experiences which address the varied learning modalities of students are provided through technology integration: Smart Boards, computer-assisted instruction based on individual needs, and computer research.

Participation in the after-school program allows students to receive additional accelerated instruction in areas where needed and enrichment activities to extend learning.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

H. S. Thompson uses an interdisciplinary approach to mathematics instruction across grade levels. Teachers provide research-based computation and problem-solving strategies in a nonthreatening environment that enhances the success of all students. These strategies build upon students' prior knowledge to promote skill and concept acquisition. At the heart of all our efforts is student success, which is articulated in our mission "to ensure that all students at H.S. Thompson Learning Center are on track to graduate from high school with the knowledge and skills required to become productive and responsible citizens."

Vocabulary development is an integral part of the mathematics curriculum. Teachers present grade-level appropriate terms through the use of graphic organizers, webbing, word walls, student definitions, and journals.

Literature introduces real-world examples of mathematics that are relevant to students' lives, and writing provides opportunities for students to increase their problem-solving abilities.

Hands-on activities and technology address the varied learning styles and skill levels of students. Students use manipulatives to grasp concepts by creating models that illustrate an understanding of the objectives being taught.

Technology is integrated throughout the mathematics curriculum and is used to reinforce, enhance, and enrich what is being taught. Types of technology include computers, Smart Boards, slates, and calculators.

Instruction is differentiated based on the academic and social needs of students, and students are placed in groups that will enhance their learning styles. They are also given an opportunity to work with other professional staff to benefit from the many, varied teaching styles.

Instruction is guided by the Principles of Learning. Socializing intelligence teaches students to believe they have the ability to analyze work and to understand and make things happen. Students are provided with the necessary skills to conduct research to find answers to solve problems. Higher-order thinking skills increase academic rigor as students raise questions to solve problems in challenging activities. Clear expectations are expressed through the use of rubrics which enable students to understand and meet criteria. Through accountable talk, students communicate with others about what they have learned, what they want to learn, and how they can apply their learning in new situations.

4. Instructional Methods:

H.S. Thompson teachers use differentiated instruction to ensure the academic success of all students. While maintaining high expectations and holding all students to the same high standards, they vary instruction to address student learning styles and multiple intelligences. Depending on student needs, differentiation may occur in product, process, complexity, or the time allowed for task completion.

In all content areas, differentiation occurs through tiered assignments. These tiered assignments provide students the opportunity to master essential skills at various levels of complexity, abstractness, and open-endedness. They also provide avenues for students to acquire content and to process, construct, and make sense of ideas.

Regular classroom instruction may be whole group, small group, or one-to-one to meet the needs of an entire class and individual students. Teachers develop materials so that all students can learn effectively, regardless of their diversity.

Instruction is also provided in special programs, including special education, ESL, bilingual, and talented and gifted. Special education programming includes resource (pull-out) for reading and mathematics for students in K-5. Students receive tailored instruction as defined by their Individual Education Plans (IEPs). Teachers use questions to guide or scaffold instruction as students engage in a "think aloud" process. All students' learning styles are considered in the presentation of lessons, allowing for student diversity while meeting their social, emotional, and academic needs. Instruction is given orally and can be repeated by peers to assist students. Students are also allowed to present information orally. Literature is read aloud, and content and skills are broken into steps throughout the lesson.

Bilingual classes are provided for PreK-2 students who are non-English speaking students, and 3-5 students are served in ESL classes.

Talented and gifted students attend a twice-a-week, pull-out program in which they engage in enrichment activities.

No one is left behind at Thompson, and the students have demonstrated their ability to learn by performing at 100% passing on state assessments.

5. Professional Development:

H.S. Thompson's professional development program is based upon the Institute for Learning (IFL). IFL focuses on what students require to become effective, independent, and motivated learners and how teachers inspire, foster, and sustain high levels of achievement. We have implemented three areas of professional development to help in improving student achievement: Professional learning community, effort-based learning and growth mind set.

At Thompson, we define a professional learning community as school staff members taking collective responsibility for achieving a shared educational purpose and collaborating with one another to achieve that purpose. We believe that each teacher's responsibility to the student must extend beyond his or her classroom to the productivity of the school organization as a whole. One example of how we incorporate this practice is through daily announcements by our principal to reinforcement student learning. Each student also writes down his/her educational goals and meets one-to-one with the principal to discuss how those goals can be achieved.

Effort-based learning focuses on how our students' intelligence can be developed through education and hard work. We have seen that, as students are confronted with challenges, they are more willing to study harder or apply a different strategy to master material.

Growth mind set encourages us to focus on student effort rather than on students' intelligence or talents. As teachers, we encourage a growth mind set in children by praising them for their effort or persistence (rather than for their intelligence), by telling success stories that emphasize hard work and love of learning, and by teaching them about the brain as a learning machine.

6. School Leadership:

The leadership structure at H. S. Thompson rests on a foundation of best practices suggested by Robert Marzano, Brian A. McNulty, and Timothy Waters. These best practices – building leadership capacity and common/shared vision and goals, along with experience and engagement with other leaders of high-performing schools – have shaped a leadership culture at Thompson that places student achievement at its core.

This leadership culture is headed by Thompson's principal, Kamalia L. Cotton, who shares this sentiment of industrialist Harvey S. Firestone: "The growth and development of people is the highest calling of leadership."

Leadership capacity for fostering shared beliefs is developed through the Campus Instructional Leadership Team (CILT). These leaders from each of the core content areas are selected through application and are influential with their peers. The principal leads CILT members in collaborative planning sessions and instructional planning meetings with the goal of improving student achievement. CILT members have an integral role in the development, design, and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices. These practices are grounded in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and research-based practices of high-achieving schools.

The principal sets the tone for learning each day and is accountable for all aspects of ensuring that policies, procedures, programs, relationships, and resources focus on improving student achievement. Each day begins with a read-aloud as the students gather in the morning before classes begin. Students enjoy listening to the principal read, and sometimes they bring books for her to read.

Every year, the principal holds goal-setting conferences with each student on the campus. The conferences allow the student and principal to engage in dialogue about expectations, priorities, and self-management of his/her own learning. Each six- weeks grading period, the principal reviews each student's report card and writes personal comments on every report card. This lets the students know how much the principal cares about their learning and their effort. During the six-weeks awards assemblies, students and teachers are recognized for their achievements.

As a servant leader, the principal is committed to the growth of the students, community, faculty, and staff of H. S. Thompson EXEMPLARY Elementary Learning Center.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3

Test: TAKS

Edition/Publication Year: New each year

Publisher: Pearson

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 95 | 77 | 91 | 91 |
| % Advanced | 77 | 33 | 14 | 34 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 26 | 43 | 59 | 61 | 77 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 95 | 77 | 91 | 91 |
| % Advanced | 77 | 33 | 14 | 34 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 26 | 43 | 59 | 61 | 77 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 93 | 67 | 93 | 93 |
| % Advanced | 86 | 18 | 7 | 37 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 28 | 42 | 46 | 58 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 100 | 100 | 88 | 98 |
| % Advanced | 67 | 64 | 29 | 31 | 10 |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 14 | 17 | 16 | 19 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes: Passing standard: 68%; Commended: 93%; and two housing projects in our attendance zone closed between 2007-2009 resulting in a loss of students.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3

Test: TAKS

Edition/Publication Year: New each year

Publisher: Pearson

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 59 | 75 | 75 | 52 |
| % Advanced | 74 | 13 | 13 | 36 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | 27 | 53 | 61 | 70 | 71 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 59 | 75 | 75 | 53 |
| % Advanced | 74 | 13 | 13 | 36 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | 27 | 53 | 61 | 70 | 71 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 56 | 67 | 73 | 51 |
| % Advanced | 79 | 13 | 7 | 41 | 9 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 37 | 43 | 54 | 53 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 64 | 93 | 81 | 53 |
| % Advanced | 67 | 13 | 24 | 24 | |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 18 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

Passing standard: 2005 - 64%, 2006 - 67%, 2007 - 64%, 2008 - 67%, 2009 - 64%

Commended: 2005 to 2008 - 94%, 2009 64%

Two housing projects in our attendance zone closed between 2007-2009 resulting in a loss of students.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4

Test: TAKS

Edition/Publication Year: New each year

Publisher: Pearson

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 83 | 71 | 90 | 63 |
| % Advanced | 45 | 20 | 24 | 23 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 51 | 49 | 60 | 69 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 83 | 70 | 90 | 63 |
| % Advanced | 45 | 20 | 24 | 23 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 51 | 49 | 60 | 69 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 78 | 71 | 91 | 55 |
| % Advanced | 36 | 18 | 29 | 23 | 9 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 33 | 34 | 44 | 53 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 93 | 71 | 86 | 82 |
| % Advanced | 56 | 25 | 19 | 27 | 23 |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 17 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

Passing standard: 67%

Commended: 93%

Two housing projects in our attendance zone closed between 2007-2009 resulting in a loss of students.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4

Test: TAKS

Edition/Publication Year: New each year

Publisher: Pearson

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 73 | 62 | 88 | 56 |
| % Advanced | 23 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 51 | 48 | 60 | 68 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 73 | 61 | 88 | 56 |
| % Advanced | 23 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 51 | 48 | 60 | 68 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 72 | 62 | 91 | 48 |
| % Advanced | 14 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 6 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 33 | 34 | 44 | 52 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 71 | 62 | 79 | 76 |
| % Advanced | 44 | | 20 | 13 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 17 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

Passing standard: 2005, 2008 and 2009 - 70%, 2006 and 2007 - 68%

Commended: 2005, 2008, 2009 - 95%, 2006-2007 - 93%

Two housing projects in our attendance zone closed between 2007-2009 resulting in a loss of students.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5

Test: TAKS

Edition/Publication Year: New each year

Publisher: Pearson

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 87 | 85 | 93 | 93 |
| % Advanced | 90 | 41 | 28 | 58 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 49 | 50 | 89 | 73 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 87 | 85 | 93 | 93 |
| % Advanced | 90 | 41 | 28 | 58 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 49 | 50 | 89 | 73 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 83 | 83 | 90 | 93 |
| % Advanced | 79 | 38 | 23 | 53 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 34 | 40 | 70 | 57 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 93 | 90 | 100 | 93 |
| % Advanced | 100 | 50 | 50 | 79 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 16 | 16 | 10 | 19 | 17 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

Passing standard: 68%

Commended: 91%

Two housing projects in our attendance zone closed between 2007-2009 resulting in a loss of students.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5

Test: TAKS

Edition/Publication Year: New each year

Publisher: Pearson

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 93 | 77 | 80 | 42 |
| % Advanced | 43 | 19 | 9 | 14 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 48 | 53 | 85 | 72 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 93 | 77 | 80 | 42 |
| % Advanced | 43 | 19 | 9 | 14 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 48 | 53 | 85 | 72 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 93 | 81 | 70 | 42 |
| % Advanced | 14 | 18 | 11 | 9 | |
| Number of students tested | 29 | 33 | 42 | 66 | 57 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 93 | 64 | 89 | 40 |
| % Advanced | 60 | 25 | 0 | 32 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 16 | 11 | 19 | 16 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

Passing standard: 2005 - 71%, 2006 to 2008 - 69%, 2009 - 67%

Commended: 93%

Two housing projects in our attendance zone closed between 2007-2009 resulting in a loss of students.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6 Test: TAKS

Edition/Publication Year: New each year

Publisher: Pearson

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | | | | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 92 | 65 |
| % Advanced | | | | 37 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 52 | 70 |
| Percent of total students tested | | | | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 92 | 65 |
| % Advanced | | | | 37 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 52 | 70 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 92 | 67 |
| % Advanced | | | | 38 | 10 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 40 | 57 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 91 | 58 |
| % Advanced | | | | 33 | 38 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 12 | 14 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

Sixth Grade was moved to Middle School starting in 2006-2007.

Passing standard: 63%

Commended: 89%

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: New each year

Grade: 6 Test: TAKS
Publisher: Pearson

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | | | | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 98 | 47 |
| % Advanced | | | | 37 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 51 | 71 |
| Percent of total students tested | | | | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 98 | 46 |
| % Advanced | | | | 37 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 51 | 71 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 97 | 46 |
| % Advanced | | | | 36 | 17 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 39 | 58 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 100 | 50 |
| % Advanced | | | | 42 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 12 | 14 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

Sixth Grade was moved to Middle School starting in the year 2006-2007.

Passing standard: 62%

Commended: 2005 - 88%, 2006 - 90%